

## RESPONSE AND REMARKS

### REJECTIONS UNDER SECTION 103(a)

A Decision On Request For Rehearing (the "Rehearing Decision") dated August 5, 2010 affirmed the Appeal Decision dated November 30, 2009, which affirmed rejections by the Office Action dated December 20, 2005 under Section 103(a) of Claims 1-13, 15-17, and 19-23 of the above-identified application as being unpatentable over Thiel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,699,258; "Thief") in view of FedEx (www.fedex.com; "FedEx").

### RESPONSE REGARDING CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 103(a)

The rejections of the Claims, the Appeal Decision, and the Rehearing Decision have been carefully considered.

Claims 1-10, and 22-23 have been amended to more distinctly claim the claimed invention. Claims 14 and 18 were previously cancelled; claims 11-12 and 15-17 have been cancelled herewith.

For the reasons given further below, it is respectfully asserted that the amended Claims are not obvious in view of, and are therefore patentable over, the cited references, including Thiel and FedEx.

Amended independent Claim 1 claims a simultaneous potential cross-comparison delivery schedule that comprises a respective service-specific, carrier-specific delivery schedule for each respective particular delivery service of the plurality of delivery services offered by each respective particular carrier of the plurality of carriers that would deliver the particular respective parcel from the first address to the second address according to the indication of the shipping date. See also, e.g., Claims 4 and 7 (claiming similar limitations). It is respectfully asserted that the combination of the cited Thiel and FedEx references do not disclose the aforementioned limitations.

Amended independent Claim 1 claims that each of the claimed service-specific, carrier-specific delivery schedules comprises a calendar delivery date and a delivery time for a corresponding delivery service offered by a corresponding carrier to deliver the particular parcel from the first address to the second address according to an indicated shipping date. See also, e.g., Claims 4 and 7 (claiming similar limitations). It

is respectfully asserted that the combination of the cited Thiel and FedEx references do not disclose the aforementioned limitations.

Dependent Claim 3 claims an online interactive prompt that is configured for receiving a user's indication of a selection of a particular respective shipping rate and for responding to the user's indication of the selection of the particular respective shipping rate with a printing of a shipping label for shipment of the particular parcel using a delivery service and carrier associated with the selected shipping rate. See *a/so, e.g.*, Dependent Claims 6 and 9 and independent Claim 10 (as amended, claiming similar limitations regarding facilitating shipment using a particular delivery service/shipment type offered by a particular carrier associated with the selected shipping rate). It is respectfully asserted that the combination of the cited Thiel and FedEx references do not disclose the aforementioned limitations.

#### CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments made herewith, it is respectfully asserted that the Claims are non-obvious in view of, and are therefore patentable over, the cited references, and are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is therefore respectfully requested that the present application be reconsidered and allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

KHORSANDI PATENT LAW GROUP, ALC

By Marilyn R. Khorsandi Oct. 4, 2010

Marilyn R. Khorsandi

Reg. No. 45,744

Customer No. 29524

Khorsandi Patent Law Group,  
A Law Corporation

140 S. Lake Ave., Ste. 312

Pasadena, California 91101-4710

Telephone No.: (626) 796-2856

Fascimile: (626) 796-2864